

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: JOINT MEETING - COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND FINANCE

DATE: DECEMBER 9, 2015

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS SEEBER
MCDEVITT
WESTCOTT
BROCK

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR DICKINSON

FINANCE:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS CONOVER
TAYLOR
SOKOL
MONROE
WOOD
KENNY
MERLINO
FRASIER

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR DICKINSON

OTHERS PRESENT:

REPRESENTING SUNY ADIRONDACK:

DR. KRISTINE DUFFY, PRESIDENT
ANN MARIE SOMMA, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES &
TREASURER
ROBERT JOY, JMZ ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS, P.C.
LARRY PALTROWITZ, LEGAL COUNSEL

KEVIN GERAGHTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

AMY BARTLETT, FIRST ASSISTANT COUNTY ATTORNEY

AMANDA ALLEN, CLERK OF THE BOARD

FRANK THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER

SUPERVISORS BEATY
GIRARD
MCDEVITT
SEEBER
SIMPSON
STROUGH

GEORGE STEC, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY RESIDENT

TRAVIS WHITEHEAD, TOWN OF QUEENSBURY RESIDENT

DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*

SARAH MCLENITHAN, DEPUTY CLERK OF THE BOARD

Please note, the following contains a summarization of the December 9, 2015 joint meeting of the Community College and Finance Committees; the meeting in its entirety can be viewed on the Warren County website using the following link: http://www.warrencountyny.gov/gov/comm/community_college/

Mr. Conover called the Finance Committee to order at 10:04 a.m.

Motion was made by Ms. Wood, seconded by Mr. Monroe and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the last Finance Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Ms. Seeber called the Community College Committee to order at 10:05 a.m.

Motion was made by Mr. Brock seconded by Mr. McDevitt and carried unanimously to approve the minutes of the last Community College Committee meeting, subject to correction by the Clerk of the Board.

Copies of the meeting agenda were distributed to the Committee members, a copy of same can be found on file with the meeting minutes.

Mr. Conover announced the sole purpose of the meeting was to receive an update regarding the projects taking place at SUNY (*State University of New York*) Adirondack. Privilege of the floor was extended to Dr. Kristine Duffy, *President of SUNY Adirondack*, who thanked the Committee for allowing her to attend today's meeting to further discuss the NSTEM (*Nursing, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics*) Building Project. She reminded the Committees this Project had been on the Colleges Facilities Mater Plan for the last twenty-three years during which time they had explored different ways to support those needs. She mentioned as time progressed they had reviewed the Colleges space utilization in order to try and make the most effective use of their resources while still meeting the needs of their students, as well as the community. She continued, the total cost for the NSTEM Building

Project would be \$17 million, which included an addition to the current science building, as well as renovation to the current space. She said this meant they would be updating their science labs to increase their size which would result in them being more efficient in terms of how they utilized their space, as well as modernizing them to ensure students had access to state of the art equipment and facilities they deserved. She informed since health care was one of the largest industries in the region and the college graduated many students from the nursing program that worked in this community at local health care facilities; she added expanding their assimilation labs would be beneficial to not only their nursing students to prepare for the workforce, but would also open up use for Glens Falls Hospital and Hudson Headwaters Health Network to educate their employees.

Dr. Duffy advised at the same time the college had been planning this project, they also submitted an application to SUNY for what they referred to as their SUNY 20/20 Capital Grant Program. She reported they had been awarded the \$9.7 million they had requested for the WORC (*Workforce Readiness Center*) which would allow the college to expand their work with local businesses in the community to provide more resources for small business start-ups and more importantly for them to scale-up. She noted they were able to demonstrate to SUNY that with expended facilities to house their continuing education programs and training they would be able to increase the number of businesses with starting-up on an annual basis which was an economic development driver for the region. She stated the additional funds allowed them to review both the NSTEM and WORC Projects together and integrate the WORC Program and facility into the NSTEM current science building which in turn resulted in a reduction of the renovation costs that were originally projected resulting in a reduction of the overall project costs for the NSTEM building from \$20 million to \$17 million. She informed they had worked with the County's leadership and their legal counsel to get to a point of being able to provide some language and resolutions for the full Board to consider in terms of being able to make a commitment to the Project. As she had previously stated, if the College was able to secure a commitment from the County for the Project by the end of this calendar year they could commence the process and start work on both Capital Projects at the same time which would provide them with an economies of scale which was also how they calculated the cost savings for the County contribution. She mentioned they had a time line set out so they could break ground in early fall so they could avoid winter construction. She apprised Robert Joy, *Principle Architect, JMZ Architects and Planners, P.C.*, was in attendance today to present a more extensive time line for the Project, as well as to answer any questions or concerns.

Mr. Joy distributed copies of the SUNY Adirondack Schedule Options for NSTEM Project which he proceeded to review in detail; *a copy of which is on file with the minutes*. He stated he had met with representatives of the County and College on November 18th to discuss the NSTEM Project during which time it was indicated how right now was the prime time for financing the Project due to historically low interest rates on bonds, as well as a very low inflation rate in the construction industry. He mentioned generally projects of this size took about a year to design and bid and about a year to construct. He apprised in order to plan projects taking place at the college they had to not only coordinate with the academic calendar to avoid disrupting the campus but also coordinate with he terms the seasonality of construction. He informed their goal was to "dovetail" things in to stretch the dollars that they had to make sure they took advantage of the seasonality. He said they were now at crunch time, as this could very well be the last opportunity to move ahead with the project in order to be able to take advantage of the opportunity the County had to lock in some very favorable pricing and conditions. He pointed out if there was a delay in the preferred time line it could increase the cost of the project in terms of the bidding because one of the reasons they had been able to reduce the Project cost to \$17 million was due to the fact that inflation rates had been relatively tame in the construction trades. He continued, they had budgeted about a 5.8% inflation rate from the initial planning to the midpoint of construction; however, he noted, if the County were to move ahead rather quickly on the Project they were projecting they could decrease that rate to about 3% in the first Phase and then possibly 5% for the second phase. He indicated if the Project was delayed they would anticipate higher rates of inflation which would in turn increase the total Project cost resulting in them having to scale back on the size of the building since the budget was fixed for the Project.

Mr. Monroe inquired whether they could remain on the same schedule but push it back a year and Mr. Joy replied affirmatively. He pointed out delaying it a year could cause them to have to reduce the size of the Project. Dr. Duffy apprised another thing to keep in mind was by delaying the Project they would lose the savings they achieved by completing the WORC Project at the same time as the NSTEM Project. Mr. Joy added a delay would increase the costs of both Projects, as they had assumed surveys, etc. that were required could be completed once for both Projects rather than having to do them separately which would be more costly.

Mr. McDevitt questioned whether it would be feasible to reduce the time set aside for the design phase even further to six months and Mr. Joy replied in the negative. He said normally projects of this size would take at least a year to design; however, he stated, due to steps the college had taken they felt they could reduce this from one year to eight months. Mr. Taylor inquired whether the intent of today's meeting was seeking a motion in support of the bonding for the Project and Mr. Conover replied that was the pleasure of the Committee. He said he., Chairman Geraghty and Ms. Seeber felt they should inform what the process would be if they were to proceed with supporting the Project to meet the preferred time line. He mentioned he believed the Committee could use this information as a basis for making some type of determination going forward.

Larry Paltrowitz, *Legal Counsel for the College*, apprised there were two projects being discussed, the WORC Project at a cost of \$9.7 million and the NSTEM Project with a total cost of \$17 million. He said from the legal perspective the first thing required from both Warren and Washington County, as well as the SUNY Adirondack Board of Trustees was to adopt a resolution authorizing the \$9.7 million WORC Project. He reminded the Committee members both Counties owned the property where the college was located in trust for the college. He said this meant in order to go forward with a significant construction project such as the WORC Project, it required an authorizing resolution; therefore, he stated, the first resolution required authorized the WORC Project for a cost of \$9.7 million at no cost to the County since it was being fully funded by the SUNY 20/20 Grant. Next, he said the County would need to authorize the \$17 million NSTEM Project. He continued, coupled with that authorizing resolution came the Local Share. He apprised \$8.5 million of the total cost would be the responsibility of New York State to provide and the other \$8.5 million was considered the responsibility of Warren and Washington Counties for what was considered to be the Local Share. He advised the statute required that there was an allocation of the Local Share based on the equalized assessed value of Warren and Washington Counties properties. He said he had worked with representatives from both Counties to calculate each Counties share of the cost which equated to \$5,763,765 for Warren County with the balance remaining being Washington Counties responsibility. He informed what the County needed to do along with resolution authorizing the \$17 million Project was include the commitment to the \$5,763,765 obligation from Warren County. He apprised what they had indicated was in order to proceed with the \$17 million Project there would also need to be an authorizing resolution for the financing of the \$5,763,765 component. He indicated this did not mean the County had to issue those bonds at all, as it just required the County to have that authorization to allow the issuance of that financing. He mentioned the primary purpose for that was to capture any expenses that may be incurred as part of this Project; therefore, he said, it was customary to have the authorizing resolution and the financing resolution completed at the same time so that there was a basis for the financing of in this case the County's share of the Project in the amount of \$5,763,765. He emphasized that was just an authorizing resolution and did not commit the County to borrow that money, as other sources of funding could be used if they were available; however, he apprised, by approving the \$17 million NSTEM Project, the authorization for that \$17 million came with the commitment that the County had to pay their Local Share of \$5,763,765. He continued, this was why they had the serial bond resolution which was just an authorizing resolution that was combined with the authorization for the \$17 million.

In conclusion, Mr. Paltrowitz informed they had to go through the SEQRA *State Quality Environmental Review Act*) Process for both projects and because both projects involved the same building although they were two separate and distinct projects they could not segment the review of that. He stated this meant both Warren and Washington County, as well as the college would be going through a SEQRA

process. He stated they had concluded the SEQRA process would be known as an unlisted action which required a short environmental assessment form to be completed by each County which along with the assistance of the architect would hopefully result a negative declaration that there would be no significant impact to the environment as a result of that SEQRA review. He mentioned the SEQRA review would be completed at the time the County would be authorizing the \$17 million Project, as well as authorizing the \$9.7 million Project. He indicated he was aware this was an abundant amount of information for the Committees to process but this was the legal process that each County and the SUNY Adirondack Board of Trustees would have to go through to move this Project forward in December.

Mr. Monroe questioned whether the Project would be delayed if any one of those entities determined they could not do a negative declaration because they would have to go through additional procedures through SEQRA and Mr. Paltrowitz replied affirmatively. He explained if there was a determination that did have a significant impact it would be placed into a Type 1 Action which would then require a long EAF (*Environmental Assessment Form*) resulting in a delay of the Project. He advised they had been working with the architect to compile the information necessary to complete that EAF. He continued, based upon all the information they had obtained from the architect the Part 1 EAF form that was completed and submitted indicated that there should be a conclusion that there was no significant environmental impact; however, he noted, each entity would go through the process and come to its own conclusion.

Mr. Conover asked who the lead agency under SEQRA would be and Mr. Paltrowitz replied that this was not a coordinated review; therefore, he said, there would not be a lead agency. He mentioned SUNY itself had no objection to the determination being made by the SUNY Adirondack Board of Trustees but this was not a coordinated review so there was no lead agency which was why all entities completed their own SEQRA process.

Ms. Seeber apprised she felt the purpose of this meeting was to yet again have a very open and honest discussion about the County's feeling and commitment to the Project, as well as address any questions or concerns. She informed she received notification from the Chairman of the Washington County Community College Committee that they had the support for the Project and would be voting on it at their December Board meeting, at which time he fully anticipated they would be moving forward with it. She said she felt it was pertinent to bring this up, as she was aware the question had been brought forward as to whether Washington County would be moving forward on this to which she was notified they would be. Next, she said, there had been some questions by some Supervisors about the Capital Chargeback money and whether this contribution in terms of the Project be credited towards the capital contribution that the County was currently not providing per FTE (*Full Time Equivalent*) in terms of matching chargeback and future legislation. She inquired whether the answer was yes to that question. Dr. Duffy advised just to be clear there was no legislation that had been adopted yet; however, she informed, there was discussion at the State level regarding posing legislation that would require the out-of-County sponsor per FTE chargeback rate to match what the County sponsors rate was. She mentioned if this were to occur and the County was not contributing anything to capital, it would be detrimental to the college. She stated although there was no legislation yet this was on the horizon. She said in general this type of capital contribution was considered a capital contribution for the County; therefore, she noted, if that legislation were to come to fruition the college would have every reason to believe this would be considered a capital contribution. She pointed out this was what other community colleges did with their County sponsors if they bond a project than that would be there capital contribution on an annual basis.

Ms. Seeber stated initially she believed the full Board had felt what was required of them in December was a resolution in support of the Project; however, she said, it was brought to her attention last week

this was not the case which was why the meeting was taking place today. She indicated neither herself or Mr. Conover assumed they would have a particular action from the Committees; however, she said, if it was the Committees desire they would like to distribute the proposed resolution to the full Board in order to allow for an ample amount of time to review and consider it. Mr. Conover clarified there would be three resolutions for the full Board to consider, the first of which related to the SEQRA Process for which encompassed both projects. The next proposed resolution, he informed would authorize the college to move forward with the WORC Project at no cost to the County. The last resolution under consideration, Mr. Conover advised, authored the County's share of funding for the NSTEM Project. Mr. Paltrowitz interjected that particular resolution included two components, the first of which was authorizing the \$17 million NSTEM Project. He said the second component of that would be authorizing the of the \$5,763,765 for Local Share for Warren County. Mr. Conover questioned whether the colleges hope was for these three resolutions to be presented at the December 18th Board meeting and Mr. Paltrowitz replied affirmatively. He added proposed resolutions had been drafted by his office and could be readily distributed following today's Committee meeting. Mr. Conover recommended that Paul Dusek, *County Administrator*, distribute those resolutions in draft form to the full Board and all involved parties as soon as possible.

Mr. Westcott inquired what type of action was required at today's meeting and Mr. Conover responded he believed their feeling was what the pleasure of the Committees was, as they could either take action on them today or schedule another meeting to allow for additional discussion. Mr. Taylor apprised he felt they should move forward with distributing the resolutions to the full Board, as he did not think they should vote on them today since they had not been distributed yet and Mr. Conover concurred.

Mr. Conover apprised he sensed that the full Board was supportive of the Project but had concerns regarding the financial impact the Project had on the County Budget. He pointed out \$95,000 had been set aside in the 2016 County Budget for the Project. He asked what the estimated annual payment for principle and interest would be on the Project and Ann Marie Somma, *Vice President for Administrative Services & Treasurer*, replied it would be \$387,000. He pointed out the \$95,000 that was budgeted for next year was slightly more than the actual amount required from Warren County for their share of the first year's costs which was \$87,000 which meant the remaining funds could be carried over to cover some of the costs in 2017. Mr. Paltrowitz indicated the estimate was based upon some type of financing early on in this process because that figure represented the interest component of that financing; therefore, he said, this was an estimate of what the interest payment would be on the financing of the \$5,763,765. He apprised there had been some confusion revolving around the \$94,000, as some Supervisors thought there was only a commitment for this figure but in reality in order to pay the \$94,000 the County would have to issue \$5,763,765 worth of financing.

Mr. Conover stated when they received the sales tax revenue figures in September of -5%, it "traumatized them" in terms of the budgeting process; therefore, he reported, the budgets going forward were modified as a result of this decrease. He indicated they had rebounded slightly in terms of the sales tax revenue during October, as the figures that were reported on displayed more than a 4% increase. He advised he had requested that Mr. Dusek calculate sales tax revenue going forward.

Mr. Dusek apprised they had not set aside any future funding for the Project other than the \$94,000 included in the 2016 County Budget since they could not budget for future years. He said if they were to move forward with the Project the County would be required to come up with about \$384,000 a year presumably for the next twenty years. He indicated since this was not built into the County's Multi Year Plan starting in 2017 they would be required to come up with the funding. He mentioned there were a number of ways this could occur such as cutting other funding sources or things they were doing in order to raise that money. As pointed out by Mr. Conover, Mr. Dusek reported he had reviewed the sales

tax revenue, noting they had only projected a .6% for 2015, 1% increase in 2017 and a 1.5% increase for future years. He said depending upon what occurred it was very possible for the County to be fortunate and collect 1% instead of the .6%, that would raise an additional \$99,000 of which the projected figures would go on top of. He stated this meant if \$99,000 more than was originally anticipated was collected, in 2016 the County would be starting with a higher figure and 1% could be added to on top of that and so on and so forth through 2017. He remarked this was a big "if" since it was dependent upon them collecting 1% in 2015 rather than the budgeted amount of .6%. He advised the same thing could occur in future years, for instance in 2016 1.5% of sales tax was collected rather than 1% as well as the additional money received in 2015, it could position the County to raise about \$300,000 that would essentially almost fund this Project.

Mr. Dusek commented these were "big ifs", noting if the economy was in a downward trend the County could actually collect less than what was budgeted for in sales tax revenue or the sales tax could remain flat. He pointed out they have had a very peculiar year this year in terms of sales tax collection, as it had fluctuated from increases to decreases throughout the year. He remarked he could not predict where they would end up in regards to sales tax collection this year; however, he noted, he felt rather certain they would be below what was budgeted for which was another important element to understand regarding this process. He stated he did not want to make it more complicated than it had to be but if they end up under what was budgeted which he felt was likely to occur they would have to transfer the difference from the fund balance to make up for the shortfall. He apprised if they were to do better than what they had projected in their overall future funding, than the County could end up with a surplus and use some of these funds for the college. He mentioned he felt this was where it left things unknown. He added they did have some property they were considering selling which would also assist with offsetting costs, as well as other areas he believed could be cut in terms of funding for projects, noting he would not get into specifics at this time. He informed one of the suggestions that was made was for the Budget Committee meetings to commence early on in 2016 so they could start the planning process earlier which would allow for more time to plan. He commented he thought it was important for them to monitor every month the County's current financial standing and plan so they were not caught off guard at the last minute which required them to cut something to make the budget work. He advised if they did not find funding sources the county would continue to deplete the fund balance until it placed the County in an unhealthy position financially. He stated the good news they had time work on that. He recommended they work on this very early on in 2016 continuing on throughout the year, as well as get things going that would assist the County to increase revenue in terms of sales of property or other methods they could discuss to ensure they were managing this properly. He pointed out if they moved forward with the Project they would be taking on a rather large commitment; however, he stated, he believed there may be ways in which they could make this work. He continued, as with projections on anything there was no way to know how things would turn out; therefore, he said, if there was a downturn in the economy they would have to figure something else out.

Mr. Westcott requested that when the draft copies of the resolution were distributed to the full Board for review it include a memo from Mr. Dusek summarizing what he just stated, as well as comments from the Budget Officer, as well as firm figures from Mr. Paltrowitz so they were aware of what the financial commitment of the County would be. He asked whether the plan was to introduce these resolutions at the December 18th Board meeting to allow them to vote upon them and Mr. Conover responded it was dependent upon whether that was the pleasure of the Finance Committee.

A lengthy discussion ensued during which time a number of Committee members voiced their opposition to the Project due to financial concerns while others conveyed their support of it. Mr. Monroe pointed out some of the financial concerns the Committee members and other Supervisors were bringing forward occurred due to mandates by the State such as the increasing personnel expenses at the County Jail which the County had no control over. He mentioned before he could vote on this he would like to see budget and what the breakdown of the hard and soft costs were and how it was all calculated, as he did not think these figures had been supplied to them. He added he had a number of concerns about the budget going forward, as well.

Ms. Seeber asked whether Chairman Geraghty or Mr. Thomas had any insight on the Project. Mr. Thomas advised as previously stated they had included \$94,000 for the NSTEM Project in the 2016 County Budget which meant they would have to come up with an additional \$293,000 to fully fund the Project next year. He reminded the Committees they also needed to take into consideration costs associated with the Court Expansion Project, pay increases, etc.; therefore, he remarked, it would be challenging to locate the additional funds required. He pointed out during several previous Budget Committee meetings he had inquired what the Supervisors would like to see cut back in order to fund this Project to which he received no reply. He apprised if the full Board voted to move forward with the Project then they would have to find a way to fund it.

Mr. Conover remarked he believed there was no benefit in delaying the Project any further due to fact that it would only result in increasing the costs of the Project. He stated he did not view this as a "heavy lift" for the County to come up with the funding required, as he felt even if they were not able to secure the full amount needed in additional funds each year, they transfer funds from the fund balance to cover the difference. He added he would be voting in favor of moving forward with the Project. He recommended the Finance Committee move the resolutions to the full Board on December 18th, as he felt this was the correct course of action at this stage since he saw no reason to delay it any further.

Chairman Geraghty stated the Town of Warrensburg was greatly impacted by the healthcare industry last year when HHHN chose to expand upon their facility there. He apprised he was aware of the fact that HHHN was planning to expand upon the services they offered at the clinic there and add more staff which would have a positive impact on their economy. He indicated although he shared the financial concerns previously stated; however, he noted, he felt they all worked together without arguing amongst themselves they would be able to come up with the funds necessary to move forward with the Project without having to raise taxes.

Travis Whitehead, *Town of Queensbury Resident*, remarked he concurred with everyone here today, as they were all trying to be fiscally conservative and look for alternative ways to come up with the funding. He mentioned there was another funding stream they should be paying attention to and that was the \$280,000 a year the County was paying for the Geothermal contract with Siemens. He stated this was a guaranteed energy performance contract that the County was not supposed to be losing money on but was on that, as well as the Co-Generation Plant at Westmount Health Facility. He said thought if they were to hold Siemens accountable for this, it could provide the bulk of the funding required for this Project.

Mr. Taylor apprised he would be voting in favor of moving forward with the Project for the reasons Mr. Conover had previously stated. In terms of finding a funding source, he reminded the Committees they had been spending around \$165,000 a month in order to continue operating Westmount Health Facility

due to the delay on the sale. He continued, he hoped the sale would go through shortly thereby improving the County's financial status.

Mr. Kenny advised he had not envisioned ending his tenure on the Board with a vote in opposition of the college since he had been supportive of them throughout his career with the County; however, he said, in order to vote in favor of moving the Project forward he would need to know where the funding was coming from. He added this was his only objection to the Project.

Mr. Girard stated he would be remiss if he did not bring up the fact that he had proposed a sales tax rate increase in 2008 when the economy was in a remission; however, he said, at that time the Board voted it down. He continued, the fact that they voted it down was positive because rather than raise the sales tax rate they cut back the budget in several areas. He apprised this allowed him to observe jobs being eliminated, the allocation to Cornell Cooperative Extension being decreased, road conditions deteriorating, the pending sale of the Westmount Health Facility due to being able to continue to afford operating it because of the changes in State and Federal funding, etc. He advised they had to keep a constant watch on the Budget and what had been forecast for future years and then they received the request from the college for support of the NSTEM Project which had not been anticipated. He remarked he believed the college was one of the nicest assets they had in the area but he thought this was point for him that broke the economic budgets back and he could not go any further because this was just spending. He commented he felt it was worse to expend money without a revenue source present. He advised he felt now was the time to raise the sales tax rate, as this would assist the County in paying for the mandated Court Expansion Project that had been put off for about ten years but could be delayed no further due to the addition of another Family Court Judge, as well as helping them pay for several other mandates that had been placed upon the County. He said the Board had attempted to create the best environment with their cutbacks such as cutting back paving of County Roads, and selling the Westmount Nursing Home. He stated he had enough of the cutbacks because he did not want to see things like the funding for Cornell Cooperative Extension cutback any further, as they provided assistance to individuals who needed it the most. He indicated he believed the NSTEM Project should be completed, as it was a step in the right direction for the college; however, he noted, he could not support it without a sales tax rate increase that would pay for the Court Expansion Project, the work needed on County Roads and this Project, as well. He pointed out 46% of the sales tax in the County was raised through the tourism industry here. He said he would rather see a great deal of the Project funded from tourists from out of this area rather than the residents here who lived with roads in deplorable conditions and no longer had a nursing home, etc., as he had reached his breaking point.

Mr. Monroe stated he concurred with Mr. Girard, pointing out Warren County was one of only three Counties in the State that had not increased their sales tax rate. He mentioned since Warren County had a strong tourism economy it made sense to him that 40-45% of the cost would be paid by non-residents. He apprised whenever he traveled he paid more occupancy and sales tax than what tourists paid in Warren County. Another thing he felt they should take a close look at, he informed, was the table that showcased the County's bonding costs and when they start phasing out. He mentioned he believed everyone should see that, as it could be that it will be tough financially for a few years but then the fact that the bond payments were dropping would cover this cost in the later years. Mr. Conover apprised this information had been presented at a Budget Meeting but he could not recall what year it was. Mr. Thomas informed this would occur in 2023.

Mr. Kenny advised he was adamantly opposed to a sales tax rate increase. Ms. Wood stated although she voted in favor of the 2016 County Budget one of her concerns with it was that there were significant increases in funding to outside organizations such as the Warren County SPCA. She continued, now they were discussing the \$387,000 bond payment that they could supposedly find funding for. She mentioned although these outside organizations did great work and were assets to the community; however, she pointed out, if they could find funding they should use it to re-establish funding from programs that had been cut internally before they distributed it to outside organizations. She apprised while she understood the value of these organizations she was concerned about the County Departments, County roads and other internal programs that had been cut back significantly over the years.

Mr. Simpson stated he believed they needed to prioritize, as they were spread out into so many different areas they were getting away from their original mission. He stated education was a root responsibility in his mind to the County. He said there were a number of organizations that would seek assistance from the County; however, he apprised, he believed they needed to stay with the program and review roads, education, etc.

Mr. Conover pointed out any borrowing assumed the funds were available to pay it back. Mr. Westcott reminded the Committees Mr. Thomas had surveyed the full Board what unfunded Projects they felt were top priority for the County to move forward with. He stated the survey resulted in the NSTEM Project being tied with County Roads as the number one priority.

Ms. Seeber apprised since the Budget Committee would be meeting more often in 2016 it would allow for more opportunity to go through the Budget line by line and discuss the organizations that request funding from the County, as well as review budgets that have been cut back in previous years. She said they were here today because of the time frame that they were looking at with the college and joining these two Projects. She informed at some point she would like to see this information be distributed to the full Board so they had a sufficient amount of time for review so they could vote on it at the December 18th Board meeting unless it was not the pleasure of these Committees.

Mr. Conover indicated they had partners in this that were making decisions; therefore, he said, without objection he felt they could take the matter up at the December 18th Board meeting, as he did not believe Committee approval was required in order to vote on the matter there. He apprised they could move the matter to the December 18th Board meeting where the Supervisors could vote their conscious. Mr. Kenny interjected he was in favor of moving the matter to the full Board.

Motion was made by Mr. Kenny, seconded by Mr. Taylor and carried by majority vote with Messrs. Merlino and Monroe voting in opposition to authorize the aforementioned request and the necessary resolutions were authorized for the December 18th Board meeting.

As there was no additional business to come before either the Community College Committee, on motion made by Mr. Westcott and seconded by Mr. McDevitt, Ms. Seeber adjourned the meeting of the Community College Committee at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah McLenithan, Deputy Clerk of the Board